arXiv:1703.09632v1 [math.AT] 28 Mar 2017

Goodwillie's Calculus of Functors and Higher Topos Theory

Mathieu Anel, Georg Biedermann, Eric Finster, André Joyal

Abstract

We prove a Blakers-Massey theorem for the Goodwillie tower of a homotopy functor and then reprove some delooping results. The theorem is derived from a generalized Blakers-Massey theorem in [ABFJ17]. Our main tool is fiberwise orthogonality. A new input is that the pushout product of a P_m-equivalence with a P_n-equivalence is a $P_{(m+n+1)}$-equivalence.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Prerequisites **4**
2.1 Topoi 4
2.2 Cubes, gaps and cogaps 4
2.3 Pushout product and join 5
2.4 Pullback hom and external orthogonality 7
2.5 Modalities and generalized Blakers-Massey theorems 9

3 Orthogonality Conditions **10**
3.1 Internal orthogonality 11
3.2 Fiberwise orthogonality 12
3.3 The fiberwise diagonal map 14

4 The Goodwillie Localization **17**
4.1 The n-excisive modality 17
4.2 Cubical Diagrams and Orthogonality 20
4.3 A Characterization of n-excisive maps 26
4.4 The Blakers-Massey Theorem for the Goodwillie Tower 29
4.5 Delooping theorems 30

A Effective Epimorphisms and Monomorphisms of n-excisive Functors **31**

1 Introduction

Goodwillie's calculus of homotopy functors [Goo90, Goo92, Goo03] is an advanced tool to deduce information on unstable homotopy theory from stable knowledge. The main goal of this article is to prove the following analogue of the Blakers-Massey theorem in the context of calculus.

Theorem 4.4.1 Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{g} & H \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ G & \longrightarrow & K \end{array}$$

be a homotopy pushout square of functors. If f is a P_m-equivalence and g is a P_n-equivalence, then the induced cartesian gap map

$$(f, g) : F \to G \times_K H$$

is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence.

The second result is a"dual" version.

Theorem 4.4.2 Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & H \\ \downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ G & \xrightarrow{g} & K \end{array}$$

be a homotopy pullback square of functors. If f is a P_m-equivalence and g is a P_n-equivalence, then the cocartesian gap map

$$\lfloor f, g \rfloor : G \sqcup_F H \to K$$

is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence.

As a consequence we can rederive known delooping results in homotopy functor calculus in an easy and conceptual way. In particular, we obtain a new proof of Goodwillie's Lemma 2.2 [Goo03] that homogeneous functors deloop, independent of the material of [Goo03, Section 2]

Both results rest on the companion article [ABFJ17] where generalized Blakers-Massey theorems were proved. There the language of higher topoi was adopted. We find it well suited for the calculus of homotopy functors as well, particularly because n-excisive functors to spaces form a higher topos and since the focus of this paper is to work fiberwise. Thus we will drop any reference to higher derived structures and take them for granted. When we talk about a "category" it is an "∞-category" and (co-)limits are to be interpreted as ∞-categorical (co-)limits. In particular, we will not use the terms "homotopy (co-)limit", as we did above for the sake of introduction. The ∞-categorical situation already describes the derived, homotopy invariant setting with all higher coherences. "Isomorphism" translates to "weak equivalence". Similarly, mapping spaces or internal hom objects are always to be taken derived. The reader

who finds this article easier to read by using model structures is invited to do so and should not have any difficulties in doing so.

The main tool in our paper [ABFJ17] and here is the notion of modality. This is a unique factorization system whose left and right class are closed under base change. An example is the factorization of a map of spaces into an n-connected map followed by an n-truncated map. That example leads to the classical Blakers-Massey theorem. Here we observe that the factorization of a natural transformation into a P_n-equivalence followed by an n-excisive map is a modality as well. This follows since Goodwillie's n-excisive approximation construction P_n is a left exact localization of the topos of functors. The left classes of these n-excisive modalities for various $n \geq 0$ are compatible with the pushout product in the following sense:

Theorem 4.3.4(4) The pushout product of a P_m-equivalence with a P_n-equivalence is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence.

This statement is our new contribution to Goodwillie calculus and immediately implies the main theorems by means of the generalized Blakers-Massey theorems from [ABFJ17]. To prove this theorem we need to take a step back and develop consequently the point of working fiberwise. A modality is a factorization system satisfying fiberwise orthogonality: two maps are fiberwise orthogonal if all of their base changes are externally orthogonal to each other (Def. 3.2.1). Similarly to the pullback hom (Subsec. 2.4) that tests for external orthogonality, we introduce the fiberwise diagonal (Def. 3.3.1) of two maps that tests fiberwise othogonality.

This fiberwise diagonal serves as a "parametrized" right adjoint to the pushout product where the pushout product is not viewed as a symmetric monoidal product on arrows but as a functor from two slices to the slice over the product of the base spaces. The resulting adjunction tricks exploited in Proposition 3.3.4 lead us to Theorem 4.3.1 where we prove that the n-excisive modalities are generated by pushout product powers. From here the proof of Theorem 4.3.4 is straightforward.

We already mentioned that the main Theorems 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 about analogues of the Blakers-Massey theorems for the Goodwillie tower are now easily deduced. This allows us in Theorem 4.5.1 to find a classifying map for the map $P_nF \to P_{n-1}$ in the Goodwillie tower and reprove delooping results (Thm. A and Cor. 4.5.3) for functors whose derivatives live only in a certain range; in particular homogeneous functors are infinitely deloopable.

To justify a portion of the result in 4.5.1 an Appendix A is added. We manage in Theorem A.0.12 to completely understand monomorphisms and effective epimorphisms in the topos $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ of n-excisive functors. As far as we know this is the first time n-excisive functors are studied as a topos and the results might be of independent interest.

Acknowledgment: The first author has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013 Grant Agreement n°263523). The second author

and this project have received funding from the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 661067.

2 Prerequisites

In this section we recall material from the our companion paper [ABFJ17]. In particular, we give the definition of a modality 2.5.1 and state our generalized Blakers-Massey theorems 2.5.6 and 2.5.7.

2.1 Topoi

This article is written using the language of higher topoi. For an outline of the theory we refer the reader to [Rez05, Joy08, Lur09]. A very brief overview of the essential properties taylored to our needs is given in [ABFJ17, Section 2]. We will now drop ∞ from the notation and refer to them simply as topoi. We write $\mathcal{S}$ for the category of spaces.

Definition 2.1.1. A topos is a left exact localization of a presheaf category $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ for some small category $\mathcal{C}$.

The reader should be aware that "left exact localization" is to be taken in the derived sense. Spelled out in the language of model categories it means "left Bousfield localization commuting with finite homotopy limits up to weak equivalence". This is in line with the general approach in this article that everything should be interpreted in ∞-categorical terms. We recall that when we speak of (co-)limits, the corresponding notions in the language of model structures are homotopy (co-)limits.

Example 2.1.2. The primary examples of topoi of interest to us here are

1. The category $\mathcal{S}$ of spaces (as modelled by topological spaces or simplicial sets with weak homotopy equivalences) is the prime example of a topos.
2. The category $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ of functors to spaces is a topos.
3. The full subcategory $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)} \subset [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ which, as explained in Example 2.5.3, is itself a topos.

We recall that within a topos colimits are preserved by base change.

2.2 Cubes, gaps and cogaps

Let $\underline{n} = \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and write $P(\underline{n})$ for the poset of its subsets. Define $P_0(\underline{n})$ to be the poset of non-empty subsets; let $P_1(\underline{n})$ be the poset of proper subsets.

Now consider a finitely complete category $\mathcal{E}$. An *n-cube* in a category $\mathcal{E}$ is a functor $\mathcal{X} : P(\underline{n}) \to \mathcal{E}$. We will refer to the canonical map

$$\mathcal{X}(\varnothing) \to \lim_{U \in P_0(\underline{n})} \mathcal{X}(U)$$

as the *cartesian gap map* or simply the *gap map* for brevity. An n-cube is said to be *cartesian* if its gap map is an isomorphism. For example, a 2-cube is cartesian if and only if it is a pullback square.

For an n-cube $\mathcal{X}$ in a finitely cocomplete category $\mathcal{E}$ there also exists the canonical map

$$\operatorname*{colim}_{U \in P_1(\underline{n})} \mathcal{X}(U) \to \mathcal{X}(\underline{n}).$$

which we will call it the *cocartesian gap map* or briefly, *cogap map*. An n-cube is *cocartesian* if its cogap map is an isomorphism. A square is cocartesian if and only if it is a pushout square.

An n-cube is *strongly cocartesian* if if every sub-2-cube is cocartesian. To be strongly cocartesian is equivalent to demanding that only every 2-dimensional face is a pushout.

Now let $\mathcal{E}$ be finitely complete and finitely cocomplete. Given a commutative square in $\mathcal{E}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & C \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle k} \\ B & \xrightarrow{h} & D \end{array}$$

We will denote the gap map by

$$(f, g) : A \to B \times_D C.$$

The cogap map of the square will be denoted by

$$\lfloor h, k \rfloor : B \cup_A C \to D.$$

Strictly speaking these maps depend on the whole square. In practice the remaining maps will always be clear from the context.

2.3 Pushout product and join

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a topos. For any two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$ the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times X & \xrightarrow{1_A \times g} & A \times Y \\ {\scriptstyle f \times 1_X}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f \times 1_Y} \\ B \times X & \xrightarrow[1_B \times g]{} & B \times Y. \end{array}$$

is cartesian, and we define the *pushout product of f and g*, denoted $f \square g$, to be the cocartesian gap map of the previous square:

$$f \square g = A \times Y \sqcup_{A \times X} B \times X \to B \times Y.$$

Let $\varnothing$ and $*$ be respectively an initial and a terminal object for $\mathcal{E}$. A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has a *strict* initial object which means that any arrow $C \to \varnothing$ is an isomorphism. In particular, since $\mathcal{E}$ has finite products, this implies $\varnothing \times X = \varnothing$ for all objects

$X \in \mathcal{E}$. Hence, the pushout product defines a symmetric monoidal structure on the category $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ of arrows, with unit $\varnothing \to *$. In particular, we have $f \square g = g \square f$ and $(f \square g) \square h = f \square (g \square h)$.

Example 2.3.1. We give some examples of pushout products that will be useful in the sequel.

1. For any C and any map $A \to B$ in $\mathcal{E}$, the map $(\varnothing \to C) \square (A \to B)$ is simply
$$(\varnothing \to C) \square (A \to B) = C \times A \to C \times B$$
2. For two pointed objects $* \to A$ and $* \to B$ in $\mathcal{E}$, we have
$$(* \to A) \square (* \to B) = A \vee B \to A \times B$$
the canonical inclusion of the wedge into the product.
3. Recall that the *join* of two objects A and B in $\mathcal{E}$, denoted $A \star B$, is the pushout of the diagram $A \leftarrow A \times B \to B$. One sees immediately that
$$(A \to *) \square (B \to *) = A \star B \to *$$
4. Since colimits in $\mathcal{E}$ commute with base change, the pushout product $f \square g$ can be thought as the "external" join product of the fibers of f and g. An easy computation shows that the fiber $(f : A \to B) \square (g : C \to D)$ at a point $(b, d) \in B \times D$ is the join of the fibers of f and g. Details can be found in [ABFJ17, Rem. 2.4].
5. For an object Z the slice category $\mathcal{E}/Z$ has its own pushout product denoted $\square_Z$. Given $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}/Z$, the corresponding formula reads
$$f \square_Z g = (A \times_Z Y) \cup_{(A \times_Z X)} (B \times_Z X) \to (B \times_Z Y).$$

As remarked in Example 4 above, the pushout product $f \square g$ of two maps can be thought of as their "external join" product. An internal version of this construction can be made when f and g share a common codomain. So let $f : X \to B$ and $g : Y \to B$ be two maps of $\mathcal{C}$. We define the *fiberwise join* of f and g, denoted $f \star_B g$ as the map obtained by pulling back the pushout product $f \square g$ along the diagonal map $B \to B \times B$. That is, as the left vertical map in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta^*(B \times Y \sqcup_{X \times Y} X \times B) & \longrightarrow & B \times Y \sqcup_{X \times Y} X \times B \\ {\scriptstyle f \star_B g}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f \square g} \\ B & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & B \times B \end{array}$$

The name fiberwise join is justified by the fact that for $b \in B$, we have the identification
$$\mathrm{fib}_b(f \star_B g) \simeq (\mathrm{fib}_b\, f) \star (\mathrm{fib}_b\, g)$$
since in any topos colimits are stable by base change.

Remark 2.3.2. As remarked in [ABFJ17], when $\mathcal{C}$ is a category with finite colimits, products, and a strict initial object, the pushout product defines a symmetric monoidal structure on the category $\mathcal{C}^{\to}$. A consequence of this fact is that when computing iterated pushout products of families of maps, we can use an alternative "balanced" presentation in terms of cubical diagrams.

To be more precise, let $\{f_i : K_i \to L_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of maps in a category $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying the hypotheses above. For $U \subseteq \underline{n}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, let us set

$$\sigma_U(i) := \begin{cases} K_i & i \notin U \\ L_i & i \in U \end{cases}$$

Then the iterated pushout product

$$f_1 \square \cdots \square f_n$$

can be identified with the cocartesain gap map of the strongly cartesian n-cubical diagram $\mathcal{X}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{X}(U) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_U(i).$$

Here strongly cartesian means that any 2-dimensional subcube is a pullback.

Similar remarks apply to the iterated fiberwise join of a family $\{f_i : K_i \to K\}_{i=1}^n$ in which all maps share a common codomain. In this case, inspection of the above formula shows that $\mathcal{X}(\underline{n}) = K^{\times n}$ and so we may identify the iterated fiberwise join

$$f_1 \star_K \cdots \star_K f_n$$

with the pullback of the cocartesian gap map described above along the n-fold diagonal map $K \to K^{\times n}$.

We will make use of these observations in Section 4 in order to relate the calculus of strongly cocartesian diagrams in a category $\mathcal{C}$ with that of orthongonality in the presheaf category $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$.

2.4 Pullback hom and external orthogonality

For two objects A, B of $\mathcal{E}$, we let $[A, B]$ be the space of maps from A to B in $\mathcal{E}$. For two maps $A \to B$ and $X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$ we consider the following commutative square in $\mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [B, X] & \longrightarrow & [B, Y] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ [A, X] & \longrightarrow & [A, Y]\,. \end{array}$$

We define the *external pullback hom* $\langle f, g \rangle$ to be the cartesian gap map of the previous square:

$$\langle f, g \rangle : [B, X] \to [A, X] \times_{[A,Y]} [B, Y]\,.$$

Let $[\![A, B]\!]$ denote the internal hom object in $\mathcal{E}$. Then we can define similarly an *internal pullback hom*

$$\langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle : [\![B, X]\!] \to [\![A, X]\!] \times_{[\![A,Y]\!]} [\![B, Y]\!],$$

which is the map in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 2.4.1. Given two objects A and X in a topos $\mathcal{E}$. The *A-diagonal of X* or shortly the *diagonal* is the map

$$\Delta_A(X) = \langle\!\langle A \to *, X \to * \rangle\!\rangle : X \to [\![A, X]\!].$$

In spaces this can be interpreted as the map that associates to an $x \in X$ the constant map with value x. The classical diagonal map $X \to X \times X$ is $\Delta_{S^0}(X)$.

Remark 2.4.2. The external and internal pullback hom define functors

$$\langle -, - \rangle : (\mathcal{E}^{\to})^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{S}^{\to} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \langle\!\langle -, - \rangle\!\rangle : (\mathcal{E}^{\to})^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}.$$

Together with the pushout product the internal pullback hom yields a closed symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. In particular, we have

$$\langle\!\langle f \,\square\, g, h \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle f, \langle\!\langle g, h \rangle\!\rangle \rangle\!\rangle .$$

Lemma 2.4.3. *For f, g and h three maps in $\mathcal{E}$, we have a canonical isomorphism*

$$\langle f \,\square\, g, h \rangle = \langle f, \langle\!\langle g, h \rangle\!\rangle \rangle .$$

Proof. For any topos $\mathcal{E}$, one has a global sections functor

$$\begin{array}{rccc} [*, -] : \mathcal{E} & \to & \mathcal{S} \\ A & \mapsto & [*, A] \end{array}$$

taking values in spaces. This extends to a functor

$$\begin{array}{rccc} [*, -]^{\to} : \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{S}^{\to} \\ A \to B & \longmapsto & [*, A] \to [*, B] \end{array}$$

of the respective arrow categories. It is easy to see that this functor is representable for the pushout product by $\varnothing \to *$, i.e. that $[*, f]^{\to} = \langle \varnothing \to *, f \rangle$. Because $(\mathcal{E}, \times, [\![-, -]\!])$ is a closed symmetric monoidal category, we have

$$[*, [\![B, X]\!]] = [* \times B, X] = [B, X] .$$

We use this to compute that

$$\begin{aligned} [*, \langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle]^{\to} &= [*, \langle\!\langle B, X \rangle\!\rangle] \longrightarrow \left[*, [\![A, X]\!] \times_{[\![A,Y]\!]} [\![B, Y]\!]\right] \\ &= [B, X] \longrightarrow [A, X] \times_{[A,Y]} [B, Y] \\ &= \langle f, g \rangle \end{aligned}$$

This proves $\langle \varnothing \to *, \langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle$, from which we derive the result

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f \square g, h \rangle &= \langle \varnothing \to *, \langle\!\langle f \square g, h \rangle\!\rangle \rangle \\ &= \langle \varnothing \to *, \langle\!\langle f, \langle\!\langle g, h \rangle\!\rangle \rangle\!\rangle \rangle \\ &= \langle f, \langle\!\langle g, h \rangle\!\rangle \rangle \,. \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.4.4. Two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$ are *externally orthogonal* or simply *orthogonal* if the map $\langle f, g \rangle$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{S}$. We write $f \perp g$ for this relation and we say that f *is left orthogonal to* g and that g *is right orthogonal to* f. For a class S of maps in $\mathcal{E}$ we define $S^{\perp}$ (resp. ${}^{\perp}S$) to be the class of maps that are right (resp. left) orthogonal to all maps in S.

Recall that for a topos $\mathcal{E}$, all slice categories $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$ are also topoi. Therefore, each $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$ has an external orthogonality relation which we will denote by $\perp_Z$.

2.5 Modalities and generalized Blakers-Massey theorems

Recall that a *factorization system* on a category $\mathcal{E}$ is the data of a pair $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ of classes of maps in $\mathcal{E}$ such that

1. every map f in $\mathcal{E}$ can be factored in $f = rl$ where $l \in \mathcal{L}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$, and
2. $\mathcal{L}^{\perp} = \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{L} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{R}$.

Definition 2.5.1. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a topos. A *modality* on $\mathcal{E}$ is a factorization system $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ such that the left class $\mathcal{L}$ is stable by base change.

Modalities were introduced in [ABFJ17]. They were conceived as an axiomatization of the n-connected/n-truncated factorization system in spaces. A central idea in this paper is that there is another family of examples.

Lemma 2.5.2. *Let F be a left exact localization of a topos $\mathcal{E}$. If we let $\mathcal{L}$ be the F-equivalences and $\mathcal{R}$ the F-local maps, then $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ forms a modality in $\mathcal{E}$.*

Example 2.5.3. Goodwillie's n-excisive approximation construction P_n is a left exact localization of the ∞-topos $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ for some small category $\mathcal{C}$ with finite colimits and a terminal object. Hence, the P_n-equivalences and the P_n-local maps form a modality. This example is developed in detail Section 4, see Definition 4.1.5.

Let $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ on a topos $\mathcal{E}$ and suppose we are give a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle k} \\ X & \xrightarrow{h} & W \end{array} \tag{2.5.4}$$

Definition 2.5.5. The square (2.5.4) is said to be $\mathcal{L}$-*cartesian* if the gap map

$$(f, g) : Z \to X \times_W Y$$

is in $\mathcal{L}$. The square is called $\mathcal{L}$-*cocartesian* if the cogap map

$$\lfloor h, k \rfloor : X \cup_Z Y \to W$$

is in $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall that, given a map $f : X \to Y$, its *diagonal* Δf is the map

$$\Delta f : X \to X \times_Y X$$

induced by pulling back f along itself. In particular $\Delta(X \to *)$ is the classical diagonal $X \to X \times X$.

In [ABFJ17], the following two facts were proven about this situation:

Theorem 2.5.6 ([ABFJ17, Thm. 4.2])**.** *Let diagram* (2.5.4) *be a pushout square. Suppose that* $\Delta f \pitchfork \Delta g \in \mathcal{L}$*. Then the square is* $\mathcal{L}$*-cartesian.*

Theorem 2.5.7 ([ABFJ17, Thm. 3.27])**.** *Let diagram* (2.5.4) *be a pullback square. Suppose that the map* $h \pitchfork k \in \mathcal{L}$*. Then the square is* $\mathcal{L}$*-cocartesian.*

3 Orthogonality Conditions

The purpose of this section is to introduce in 3.2 the condition of fiberwise orthogonality, denoted $\perp\!\!\!\perp$. This notion extends the classical notion of orthogonality related to unique lifting properties and unique factorization systems, denoted $\perp$ as well as its internalisation $\underline{\perp}$. Although our focus is mainly on $\perp\!\!\!\perp$, it is convenient to formulate its properties as properties of $\perp$. So we provide some recollection on the matter. The relation $\underline{\perp}$ is introduced only for comparison purposes and to avoid any confusion between $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ and $\underline{\perp}$.

Let us point out that our motivation for introducing fiberwise orthogonality and the fiberwise diagonal is to prove Proposition 3.3.4. This eventually leads to Theorem 4.3.4 that is our new ingredient to Goodwillie calculus that lets us prove the Blakers-Massey Theorem for the Goodwillie tower.

We shall fix in the whole section a topos $\mathcal{E}$. We shall denoted by $\varnothing$ and $*$ respectively the initial and terminal object of $\mathcal{E}$. For sake of simplicity, all the constructions of the section will be defined in $\mathcal{E}$, even though most of them can be defined in categories with less structure (for example in any locally cartesian closed category).

Notation 3.0.1. Given a map $f : X \to Y$ in a topos $\mathcal{E}$, it can be viewed as object f in $\mathcal{E}_Y$. We will sometimes abuse notation and denote the corresponding object in $\mathcal{E}_{/Y}$ simply by X.

If another map $y : Z \to Y$ is given, we will denote by f_Z the base change of f along y to $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$, i.e.

$$f_Z = y^*(f) : X \times_Y Z \to Z.$$

In the proof of Proposition 3.3.4 a different convention is used and explained there.

For an object Z and a map $f : A \to B$ we write $Z \times f : Z \times A \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_Z \times f} Z \times B$.

3.1 Internal orthogonality

The notion of internal orthogonality is obtained if one replaces the enrichment over spaces in the definition of external orthogonality 2.4.4 by internal hom objects. We will say that two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ are *internally orthogonal*, and write $f \pitchfork g$, if the map $\langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{E}$. Similarly we say that f *is internally left orthogonal to* g and that g *is internally right orthogonal to* f. As above one can define classes $S^{\pitchfork}$ and ${}^{\pitchfork}S$ analogously.

Since each slice $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$ has its own internal hom objects it has an external orthogonality relation which we will denote by $\pitchfork_Z$

Lemma 3.1.1. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $f \pitchfork g$

(2) *For any* $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ *we have* $(Z \times f) \perp g$.

In particular, $f \pitchfork g$ *implies* $f \perp g$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4.3 there is an isomorphism

$$\langle \varnothing \to Z, \langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle \rangle = \langle (\varnothing \to Z) \,\square\, f, g \rangle = \langle Z \times f, g \rangle .$$

Hence, (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). For the converse we compute for $h : A \to B$

$$\langle \varnothing \to Z, h \rangle = [Z, A] \xrightarrow{[Z,h]} [Z, B] .$$

Thus, h is an isomorphism if and only if for all Z the map $\langle \varnothing \to Z, h \rangle$ is an isomorphism. If we insert $h = \langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle$ into the first isomorphism above we obtain (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Setting $Z = *$ yields the implication $f \pitchfork g \;\Rightarrow\; f \perp g$. □

The following lemma proves that base change commutes with internal homs.

Lemma 3.1.2. *For three objects* A, B *and* C *in any topos* $\mathcal{E}$, *we have a canonical isomorphism*

$$[\![A, B]\!] \times C = [\![A \times C, B \times C]\!]_C$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{/C}$ *where* $[\![-,-]\!]_C$ *is the internal hom in* $\mathcal{E}_{/C}$.

Proof. This is proven by adjunction: let D be an object in $\mathcal{E}_{/C}$, then we have the following equivalences

$$\begin{aligned}
&D \to [\![A, B]\!] \times C && \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{/C} \\
&D \to [\![A, B]\!] && \text{in } \mathcal{E} \\
&A \times D \to B && \text{in } \mathcal{E} \\
&(A \times C) \times_C D \to B \times C && \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{/C} \\
&D \to [\![A \times C, B \times C]\!]_C && \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{/C}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma proves that these internal orthogonality relations are compatible with base change.

Lemma 3.1.3. *For any two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$, and for any object $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ we have*

$$f \perp g \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f_Z \perp_Z g_Z$$

Moreover, this is an equivalence if u is an effective epimorphism.

Proof. Using Lemma 3.1.2, we can show that $\langle f, g\rangle_Z = \langle f_Z, g_Z\rangle$. Then if $\langle f, g\rangle$ is an isomorphism, so are $\langle f, g\rangle_Z$ and $\langle f_Z, g_Z\rangle$. The last assertion follows because isomorphism decend along effective epimorphisms. □

3.2 Fiberwise orthogonality

We introduce our main notion of orthogonality. Intuitively, two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ will be said to be *fiberwise orthogonal* if each fiber of f is orthogonal to each fiber of g as objects. However, in order to make this precise we need to work with "generalized fibers", i.e. base changes of maps but viewed as objects in slice categories.

Definition 3.2.1. We will say that two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ are *fiberwise orthogonal*, which we will denote $f \perp\!\!\!\perp g$, if, for any $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ and any maps $b : Z \to B$ and $y : Z \to Y$, it is true in $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$ that

$$f_Z \perp_Z g_Z.$$

Lemma 3.1.3 proves also that fiberwise orthogonality is a property stable by base change. We list several characterizations of fiberwise orthogonality.

Proposition 3.2.2. *Given two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $f \perp\!\!\!\perp g$.

(2) *The base changes of f and g onto $B \times Y$ along the projections to B and Y satisfy*

$$f_{B\times Y} \perp_{B\times Y} g_{B\times Y}.$$

(3) *The diagonal map*

$$\Delta_{f_{B\times Y}}(g_{B\times Y}) : g_{B\times Y} \to [\![f_{B\times Y}, g_{B\times Y}]\!]_{B\times Y}$$

(*see* Definition 2.4.1) *is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{E}_{/B\times Y}$.*

(4) *For any $Z \to B \times Y$ and any $T \to Z$ we have*

$$f_T \perp_Z g_Z.$$

(5) *For any $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ and any maps $b : Z \to B$ and $y : Z \to Y$, it is true in $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$ that*

$$f_Z \perp_Z g_Z.$$

(6) *For any two maps $Z \to B$ and $Z' \to B$ we have $f_Z \perp g_{Z'}$.*

(7) *For any map $Z \to B$ we have $f_Z \perp g$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) This is obvious since (2) is a special case of (1).

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) This follows from Lemma 3.1.3 that states that orthogonality is stable by base change.

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) This is equivalent by the definition of orthogonality in $\mathcal{E}_{B\times Y}$.

(1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) This is Lemma 3.1.1 applied to the topos $\mathcal{E}_{/Z}$.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (5) Set $T \to Z = \mathrm{id}_Z$.

(5) $\Leftrightarrow$ (6) We need to prove that for all Z and all $B \leftarrow Z \to Y$,

$$f_Z \perp_Z g_Z \iff \forall\, U \to B,\ \forall\, T \to Y,\ f_U \perp g_T.$$

We consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U \times_B A & \longrightarrow & U \times_Y X & \longrightarrow & T \times_Y X \\ {\scriptstyle f_U}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle g_U}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g_T} \\ U & = & U & \xrightarrow{h} & T \end{array}$$

where h is arbitrary and the right square is cartesian. Because the right square is cartesian, the space of diagonal fillers of the outer square is equivalent to that of the left square. When h varies, the former condition gives $f_U \perp g_T$ and the latter $f_U \perp_U g_U$, hence proving their equivalence.

(6) $\Leftrightarrow$ (7) Since it is clear that (6) $\Rightarrow$ (7), we need to show the other implication. Let f_U be the base change of f along some map $U \to B$, and g_T the base change of g along some map $h : T \to Y$, we consider the following diagram where the left square is commutative and the right square is cartesian

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U \times_B A & \longrightarrow & T \times_Y X & \longrightarrow & X \\ {\scriptstyle f_U}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle g_T}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ U & \longrightarrow & T & \xrightarrow{h} & Y. \end{array}$$

Again, because the right square is cartesian, the space of diagonal fillers of the outer square is equivalent to that of the left square, which proves (7) $\Rightarrow$ (6).

(7) $\Rightarrow$ (4) Let us consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} T \times_B A & \xrightarrow{k} & Z \times_Y X & \longrightarrow & X \\ {\scriptstyle f_T}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle g_Z}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ T & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & Y. \end{array}$$

where the right square is cartesian and k is any map such that the left square is commutative. Condition (4) says that for any such k the space of fillers of the left square is contractible. Since the right square is cartesian this is equivalent to the outer square having a contractible space of fillers. But Condition (7) states that any map from f_T to g, i.e. a commutative square, has a contractible space of fillers. So (7) implies (4). □

Example 3.2.3. Let A and X be two objects of $\mathcal{C}$. The maps $A \to *$ and $X \to *$ are externally orthogonal, if any map $A \to X$ factors through $*$. These maps are internally orthogonal if $\Delta_A(X) : X \to [\![A, X]\!]$ is an isomorphism. In this special case, fiberwise orthogonality is the same as internal orthogonality.

The comparison between the conditions of 3.2.2(7) and 3.1.1(2) shows the difference between the fiberwise orthogonality and the internal notion.

Lemma 3.2.4. *A factorization system is a modality if and only if its left and right class determine each other via fiberwise orthogonality.*

Proof. The fiberwise orthogonality forces the left class to be closed by base change and vice versa. This is exactly what the equivalence between conditions (1) and (7) of Proposition 3.2.2 means. □

3.3 The fiberwise diagonal map

We saw that the external and internal orthogonality of two maps f and g can be detected by the condition that some map ($\langle f, g\rangle$ or $\langle\!\langle f, g\rangle\!\rangle$) be an isomorphism. The same thing is true for the fiberwise orthogonality, although the construction of the corresponding map is a bit more involved.

Definition 3.3.1. Take two maps $f : A \to B$ and $g : X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$; pull them back to the common target $B \times Y$, i.e. consider the maps

$$f_{B\times Y} = f \times \mathrm{id}_Y : A \times Y \to B \times Y$$

and

$$g_{B\times Y} = \mathrm{id}_B \times g : B \times X \to B \times Y$$

and view them as objects over $B \times Y$. In the slice $\mathcal{E}_{/B\times Y}$ one can form the $f_{B\times Y}$-diagonal of $g_{B\times Y}$ already used in 3.2.2(3). We will denote this diagonal by $\{f, g\}$ and name it the *fiberwise diagonal map*. In the notation of Definition 2.4.1 we have

$$\{f, g\} = \Delta_{f_{B\times Y}}(g_{B\times Y}) = \langle\!\langle f_{B\times Y}, g_{B\times Y}\rangle\!\rangle_{B\times Y},$$

where the internal pullback hom on the right is taken in the topos $\mathcal{E}_{/B\times Y}$. Explicitly,

$$\{f, g\} : \begin{array}{c} B \times X \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\mathrm{id}_B, g)} \\ B \times Y \end{array} \longrightarrow \left[\!\!\left[\begin{array}{ccc} A \times Y & & B \times X \\ & \searrow^{(f, \mathrm{id}_Y)} \swarrow_{(\mathrm{id}_B, g)} & \\ B \times Y & & B \times Y \end{array} \right]\!\!\right]_{B\times Y}.$$

The map $\{f, g\}$ will be viewed as a map in $\mathcal{E}_{/B\times Y}$.

Remark 3.3.2. Let $b : * \to B$ and $y : * \to Y$ be points of B and Y. We denote by f_b and g_y the corresponding fibers of f and g. Since in a topos $\mathcal{E}$ colimits commute with base change, the fiber of $\{f, g\}$ at (b, y) can be proven to be the diagonal map

$$g_y \to [\![f_b, g_y]\!].$$

This is one of the reasons why we call this map the fiberwise diagonal map.

Proposition 3.3.3. *Let f and g be maps in $\mathcal{E}$, then f is fiberwise orthogonal to g, i.e. $f \pitchfork g$, if and only if $\{f, g\}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. This is exactly the content of 3.2.2(3). □

We now arrive at the key technical result.

Proposition 3.3.4. *The following formula is true in any topos:*

$$\{f \square g, h\} = \{f, \{g, h\}\}.$$

For the proof of this proposition we need the followng two auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 3.3.5. *For all A, C and $B \to C$ in any topos, the following square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\![A \times C, B]\!]_C & \longrightarrow & [\![A, B]\!] \\ \downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow \\ C & \longrightarrow & [\![A, C]\!], \end{array}$$

where the bottom map is the diagonal map, is a pullback.

Proof. Using $C = [\![A \times C, C]\!]_C$ at the bottom left, we can factor the square as

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} [\![A \times C, B]\!]_C & \longrightarrow & [\![A, B]\!] \times C & \longrightarrow & [\![A, B]\!] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ [\![A \times C, C]\!]_C & \longrightarrow & [\![A, C]\!] \times C & \longrightarrow & [\![A, C]\!], \end{array}$$

Then, the right square is obviously cartesian. To prove that the left square is also cartesian we need the isomorphism $[\![A, B]\!] \times C = [\![A \times C, B \times C]\!]_C$ from Lemma 3.1.2. The left square is cartesian as the image of the cartesian square in $\mathcal{E}_{/C}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \longrightarrow & B \times C \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C & \longrightarrow & C \times C \end{array}$$

by the functor $[\![A \times C, -]\!]_C$ which preserves limits. □

Lemma 3.3.6. *The square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\![X \times Z^Y, Z]\!]_{Z^Y} & \longrightarrow & Z^X \\ \downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow \\ Z^Y & \longrightarrow & Z^{X\times Y} \end{array}$$

is a pullback. Hence, there is a canonical isomorphism

$$Z^{X\star Y} = [\![X \times Z^Y, Z]\!]_{Z^Y}.$$

Proof. Setting $A = X$, $B = Z$ and $C = Z^Y$ in the previous lemma we find that the square above is a pullback as claimed. Since the join is the pushout of the projections

$$X \leftarrow X \times Y \rightarrow Y,$$

the pullback of this square is canonically isomorphic to $Z^{X\star Y}$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3.4. We consider first the special case where the maps are of the following form

$$f : X \to * \ , \ g : Y \to * \ , \ h : Z \to *.$$

Then the map $\{f \square g, h\}$ becomes the $X \star Y$-diagonal of Z

$$\{X \star Y \to *, Z \to *\} = Z \to Z^{X\star Y}.$$

On the other hand, the map $\{f, \{g, h\}\}$ becomes

$$\{X \to *, Z \to Z^Y\} = Z \to [\![X \times Z^Y, Z]\!]_{Z^Y}.$$

Lemma 3.3.6 shows that these two maps are the same. This proves our claim in the special case.

We prove the general case by arguing fiberwise, i.e. by viewing our maps as objects in the respective slice categories and then appealing to the special case above. We introduce the following notation (differing from 3.0.1). First, we will denote the cartesian product of two objects I and J in $\mathcal{E}$ by concatenation IJ. Then, for a map $f : X \to I$ in a topos $\mathcal{E}$, we will abuse notation and denote by X the corresponding object in $\mathcal{E}_{/I}$. If another objet $J \in \mathcal{E}$ is given, we will denote by X_J the base change of $X \in \mathcal{E}_{/I}$ to $\mathcal{E}_{/IJ}$ along the projection $I \times J \to I$, i.e. X_J is the map $X \times J \to I \times J$.

For two maps $f : X \to I$ and $g : Y \to J$, the map $f \square g$ in $\mathcal{E}$ corresponds to the object

$$X_J \star Y_I$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJ}$, where the join is also computed in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJ}$. For a third object K, it is easy to compute that

$$(X_J \star Y_I)_K = X_{JK} \star Y_{IK}$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$.

Similarly, for two maps $g : Y \to J$ and $h : Z \to K$, the map $\{g, h\}$ is defined as the map in $\mathcal{E}_{/JK}$

$$\langle Y_K \to *, Z_J \to * \rangle$$

where the pullback hom is computed in $\mathcal{E}_{/JK}$. For a third object $I \in \mathcal{E}$, because the pullback functor $\mathcal{E}_{/JK} \to \mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$ preserve exponential, we have also

$$\begin{aligned}(\langle Y_K \to *, Z_J \to * \rangle)_I &= (Z_J \to [\![Y_K, Z_J]\!])_I = Z_{IJ} \to [\![Y_{IK}, Z_{IJ}]\!] \\ &= \langle Y_{IK} \to *, Z_{IJ} \to * \rangle\end{aligned}$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$. Finally, we obtain the following canonical isomorphisms:

$\{f \,\square\, g, h\}$	viewed as a map in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$
$= \langle (X_J \star Y_I)_K \to *, Z_{IJ} \to * \rangle$	join in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJ}$, bracket in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$
$= \langle X_{JK} \star Y_{IK} \to *, Z_{IJ} \to * \rangle$	computed in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$
$= \langle X_{JK} \to *, \langle Y_{IK} \to *, Z_{IJ} \to * \rangle \rangle$	special case applied to the topos $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$
$= \langle X_{JK} \to *, (\langle Y_K \to *, Z_J \to * \rangle)_I \rangle$	inside bracket computed in $\mathcal{E}_{/JK}$
$= \{f, \{g, h\}\}$	viewed as a map in $\mathcal{E}_{/IJK}$.

□

Remark 3.3.7. It is possible to understand Proposition 3.3.4 as coming from a symmetric monoidal closed structure. Recall the closed monoidal structure $(\square, \langle -, - \rangle)$ in the arrow category $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$, then there exists a parametrized version of this monoidal structure on the *category of parametrized arrows* (whose objects are commutative triangles in $\mathcal{E}$). The bracket $\{-, -\}$ is the parametrized version of $\langle -, - \rangle$.

4 The Goodwillie Localization

We will now revisit the Goodwillie n-excisive localization from the perspective of topos theory. Our approach here is not the most general possible. In [BR14] a reasonably general framework for Goodwillie calculus in the language of model categories is developed. In [Heu15], the author constructs Goodwillie approximations of abitrary categories. Here, however, we are particularly interested in functor categories, and more specifically, those valued in spaces.

4.1 The n-excisive modality

All of our arguments can be carried out in the presheaf topos $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ where $\mathcal{C}$ is a category with finite colimits and a terminal object, and hence we will work in that level of generality. We note that the standard examples of finite spaces ($\mathcal{F}in$) and finite pointed spaces ($\mathcal{F}in_*$) fall into this category. Moreover, the class of such categories is closed under slicing and taking pointed objects. It

includes in particular the source categories used by Goodwillie to construct the Goodwillie tower of a functor at a fixed oject.

We fix such a category $\mathcal{C}$ in this section, writing $*$ and $\varnothing$ for the terminal and initial objects respectively. Recall that the starting point for Goodwillie calculus is the following

Definition 4.1.1. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{S}$ is n-excisive if it carries strongly cocartesian $(n+1)$-cubes in $\mathcal{C}$ to cartesian cubes in $\mathcal{S}$.

In order to provide examples of n-excisive functors, Goodwillie introduces the following construction. Given a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{S}$, define a new functor T_nF by the formula:

$$T_nF(K) \coloneqq \lim_{U \in P_0(\underline{n+1})} F(K \star U)$$

There is a natural map

$$t_nF : F \to T_nF$$

determined at an object K by the cartesian gap map of the cube $U \mapsto F(K \star U)$.

Remark 4.1.2. While we do not require that the category $\mathcal{C}$ admits finite products, the above formula nonetheless makes sense in our setting. Indeed, as $\mathcal{C}$ admits finite coproducts, it admits a tensoring over the category of finite sets by setting

$$K \otimes U = \coprod_U K$$

Since $\mathcal{C}$ has a terminal object, we can regard U as an object of $\mathcal{C}$ by considering the object $* \otimes U$. One can easily check that this makes $K \otimes U$ into a product in $\mathcal{C}$, so that one can define the join using the usual formula. Equivalently, one may define $K \star U$ directly by the colimit:

$$K \star U = \operatorname{colim} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccccc} & & K & & \\ & \swarrow & & \searrow & \\ * & & \cdots & & * \end{array} \right\}$$

with U copies of the terminal object appearing in the diagram. When $\mathcal{C}$ is taken to be $\mathcal{F}in$ or $\mathcal{F}in_*$, this definition coincides with the standard one.

With this construction in hand, we now iterate, defining a functor P_nF as the colimit of the induced sequence

$$P_nF \coloneqq \operatorname{colim}\{F \to T_nF \to T_n^2F \to \cdots\}$$

We summarize the relevant facts about this construction with the following

Proposition 4.1.3 (Goodwillie [Goo03])**.** *Let $F \in [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$.*

1. *P_nF is n-excisive.*
2. *The functor $P_n : [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}] \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ commutes with finite limits.*

3. *The canonical map $F \to P_n F$ is universal for maps from F to n-excisive functors. In particular, the functor P_n is idempotent.*

Proof. The proofs appearing in [Goo03], as well as Rezk's streamlined version [Rez13] are sufficiently general to go through in our setting with only minor modifications. □

Let us write $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ for the full subcategory of n-excisive functors. The previous proposition can be summarized by asserting that the functor

$$P_n : [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}] \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$$

is a left exact localization [Lur09, Prop. 5.2.7.4]. In particular, $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ is itself a topos [Lur09, Prop. 6.1.0.1]). As is the case for any localization, we can now single out two classes of maps.

Definition 4.1.4. Let $f : F \to G$ be a map of functors.

1. We say that f is *P_n-local* if the canonical square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & P_n F \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_n f} \\ G & \longrightarrow & P_n G \end{array}$$

   is a pullback.

2. We say that f is a *P_n-equivalence* if the map $P_n f$ is an isomorphism.

Definition 4.1.5. It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.5.2 that the pair

(P_n-equivalences, P_n-local maps)

forms a modality in the sense of Definition 2.5.1. We will refer to this as the *n-excisive modality*.

Since the Generalized Blakers-Massey theorem of [ABFJ17] applies to an *arbitrary* modality on a topos, we may apply the result already at this point, using nothing but the left-exactness of the functor P_n. The statement obtained is the following:

Proposition 4.1.6. *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{g} & H \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ G & \longrightarrow & K \end{array}$$

be a pushout square of functors. Suppose that $\Delta f \square \Delta g$ is a P_n-equivalence. Then so is the cartesian gap map

$$(f, g) : F \to G \times_K H$$

We think the reader will agree that the statement in its current form is not entirely satsifactory: supposing that f is a P_i-equivalence and g is a P_j-equivalence, we would like a determination of n in terms of i and j. In the following sections, we will develop the tools to make such a calculation using the calculus of orthogonality developed above. The final result is the following.

Theorem 4.1.7. *Let f be a P_i-equivalence and g a P_j-equivalence. Then the map*

$$\Delta f \square \Delta g$$

is a P_{i+j+1} equivalence.

4.2 Cubical Diagrams and Orthogonality

In order to prove Theorem 4.1.7, we are going to examine how the notion of cubical diagram in $\mathcal{C}$ is transformed by the Yoneda embedding

$$y : \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}].$$

We will see that there is a close connection between strongly cocartesian cubical diagrams in $\mathcal{C}$ and fiberwise join products in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$, leading to a number of useful characterizations of the classes of P_n-equivalences and P_n-local maps. From here, the calculus of orthogonality, and in particular the adjunction fomula of Proposition 3.3.4 ultimately lead to the desired result. In the discussion which follows, we write

$$R^K = \mathcal{C}(K, -) = y(K)$$

for the representable functor determined by an object $K \in \mathcal{C}$. For a map $k : K \to L$ we write

$$R^k = y(k) : \mathcal{C}(L, -) \to \mathcal{C}(K, -)$$

for the induced map. We recall for later use that the Yoneda embedding preserves all limits and hence sends colimits in $\mathcal{C}$ to limits in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$.

Now let $\mathcal{X}$ be a cubical diagram in $\mathcal{C}$ and let us put $K = \mathcal{X}(\varnothing)$. We denote be $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ the cubical diagram obtained by composition with the Yoneda embedding. That is, $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = y \circ \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{op}}$. The cocartesian gap map of this cube takes the form

$$\lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor : \operatorname*{colim}_{U \neq \varnothing} R^{\mathcal{X}(U)} \to R^K$$

The interest in this map arises from the following elementary observation:

Lemma 4.2.1. *Let $F \in [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ be a functor. Then*

$$\lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor \perp (F \to *) \iff F \circ \mathcal{X} \text{ is cartesian}$$

Proof. Unfolding the definition of the pullback hom $\langle \lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor, F \to * \rangle$ (and ignoring the trivial factors) we find

$$\langle \lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor, F \to * \rangle : [R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)}, F] \to [\operatorname*{colim}_U R^{\mathcal{X}(U)}]$$

But of course $[R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)}, F] \simeq F(\mathcal{X}(\varnothing))$ and

$$\begin{aligned}[\operatorname*{colim}_U R^{\mathcal{X}(U)}, F] &\simeq \lim_U [R^{\mathcal{X}(U)}, F] \\ &\simeq \lim_U F(\mathcal{X}(U))\end{aligned}$$

by Yoneda. Hence this is the map

$$\langle \lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor, F \to * \rangle : F(\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)) \to \lim_U F(\mathcal{X}(U))$$

which is an isomorphism exactly if the cube $F \circ \mathcal{X}$ is cartesian. □

Corollary 4.2.2. *A functor $F \in [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ is n-excisive if and only if, for every strongly cocartesian $(n+1)$ cube $\mathcal{X}$, we have $\lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor \perp F \to *$.*

In view of the previous corollary, it is natural to extend the definition of n-excisiveness to maps in a wat that a functor is n-excisive if and only if the map $F \to *$ is so. Concretely, we have

Definition 4.2.3. A map $f : F \to G$ of functors is said to be *n-excisive* if for all strongly cocartesian $(n+1)$-cubes $\mathcal{X}$ we have $\lfloor \mathcal{X} \rfloor \perp f$.

For convenience we note that f is n-excisive if and only if for all strongly cocartesian $\mathcal{X}$ as above, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)) & \longrightarrow & \lim_{U \neq \varnothing} F(\mathcal{X}(U)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G(\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)) & \longrightarrow & \lim_{U \neq \varnothing} G(\mathcal{X}(U)) \end{array}$$

is a pullback.

The following construction is a useful source of strongly cocartesian diagrams. The reader may wish to compare [BJM15, Example 2.8] where a similar construction is considered.

Construction 4.2.4. Let $\{k_i : K_i \to L_i\}_{i=0}^n$ be a family of maps in $\mathcal{C}$. For $U \subseteq \underline{n+1}$, define

$$\sigma_U(k_i) = \begin{cases} K_i & i \notin U \\ L_i & i \in U \end{cases}$$

Associated to the family $\{k_i\}$ is a cubical diagram $\mathcal{K}$ defined by the formula

$$\mathcal{K}(U) = \bigsqcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sigma_U(k_i)$$

where for $U \subseteq V$, the induced map $\mathcal{K}(U) \to \mathcal{K}(V)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{K}(U \hookrightarrow V) = \begin{cases} k_i & i \in V \smallsetminus U \\ \mathrm{id}_{\sigma_V(i)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.2.5. *For any family of maps $\{k_i : K_i \to L_i\}_{i=0}^n$ the cubical diagram $\mathcal{K}$ is strongly cocartesian.*

As above, we obtain a cubical diagram $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ by composition with Yoneda. The corresponding cocartesian gap map takes the form

$$\lfloor \mathcal{K} \rfloor : \operatorname*{colim}_{U \neq \emptyset} \mathcal{K}(U) \to R^{L_1} \times \cdots \times R^{L_n}$$

Moreover, this map is easy to identify.

Lemma 4.2.6.

$$\lfloor \mathcal{K} \rfloor = R^{k_1} \square \cdots \square R^{k_n}$$

Proof. Under the Yoneda embedding, the definition of the cube $\mathcal{K}$ is transformed exactly into the definition of the balanced pushout product given in Remark 2.3.2. □

Example 4.2.7. Suppose the category $\mathcal{C}$ is *pointed*, that is, that the initial and terminal objects coincide in $\mathcal{C}$. It will be convenient in this case to write $\vee$ for the coproduct in $\mathcal{C}$ in order to make contact with the traditional notation. In particular, we have $K \vee * \simeq K$ for all objects $K \in \mathcal{C}$.

Now consider a family of objects $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Applying Construction 4.2.4 to the collection of maps $\{K_i \to *\}_{i=1}^n$ we find that the resulting cube may be more simply described as

$$\mathcal{K}(U) = \bigvee_{i \notin U} K_i$$

Now let $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{S}$ be a functor. Unraveling the definition shows that the pullback hom $\langle \lfloor \mathcal{K} \rfloor, F \rangle$ is the map

$$F(\bigvee_i K_i) \to \lim_{U \neq \emptyset} F(\bigvee_{i \notin U} K_i)$$

The fiber of this map is what Goodwillie refers to as the *n-th cross-effect*, writing $(cr_n F)(K_1, \ldots, K_n)$. It follows immediately from these considerations that we have $\lfloor \mathcal{K} \rfloor \perp (F \to *)$ for every family $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of objects of $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if F is *of degree* $(n-1)$ in the sense of [BJM15, Definition 3.21]; that is, $cr_n F$ vanishes.

It is well known that to be of degree n is strictly weaker than to be n-excisive. Nonetheless, we will show below that we can recover the notion of n-excisiveness from the cubical diagrams $\mathcal{K}$ by replacing the external orthogonality relation $\perp$ by the stronger fiberwise orthogonality relation $\underline{\perp}$. It is exactly this observation which motivated us to introduce this notion.

Construction 4.2.4 turns out to be quite general: in fact, as we now show, *every* cubical diagram can be obtained from it after a single cobase change. To make this precise, suppose we are given a strongly cocartesian cube $\mathcal{X} : P(\underline{n}) \to \mathcal{C}$. Let us put $K = P(\emptyset)$ and $K_i = P(\{i\})$. The functorial action of $\mathcal{X}$ gives us maps

$$k_i := \mathcal{X}(\emptyset \to \{i\}) : K \to K_i.$$

Applying Construction 4.2.4, we obtain a new cubical diagram which, in this case, we will denote by $\mathcal{X}_\square$ (the notation being inspired by Lemma 4.2.6 above). Unwinding the definition, we find that

$$\mathcal{X}_\square(\varnothing) = K^{\sqcup n}$$

so that the codiagonal $\nabla : K^{\sqcup n} \to K$ provides a canonical map $\mathcal{X}_\square(\varnothing) \to \mathcal{X}(\varnothing)$.

Lemma 4.2.8. *The strongly cocartesian cube $\mathcal{X}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{X}_\square$ by cobase change along the codiagonal map*

$$\nabla : K^{\sqcup n} \to K$$

Proof. The lemma asserts that for any $U \subseteq \underline{n}$, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K \sqcup \cdots \sqcup K & \longrightarrow & K \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigsqcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sigma_U(i) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}(U) \end{array}$$

is a pushout. But since $\mathcal{X}$ is strongly cocartesian, we have that

$$\mathcal{X}(U) = \operatorname{colim} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} & & K_{i_1} \\ & \nearrow & \vdots \\ K & \longrightarrow & K_{i_2} \\ & \searrow & \vdots \\ & & K_{i_3} \end{array} \right\}_{i_k \in U}$$

and one easily sees that this coincides with the pushout above by a simple cofinality argument. □

It is immediate from the previous lemma and the fact that the Yoneda embedding sends colimits in $\mathcal{C}$ to limits in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ that the corresponding cube of representables $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ is obtained from $\hat{\mathcal{X}_\square}$ by base change along the n-fold diagonal map

$$\Delta : R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)} \to (R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)})^{\times n} \simeq R^{\mathcal{X}_\square(\varnothing)}$$

It will be convenient in what follows to introduce special notation for the cocartesian gap maps of these two cubes. We will use this notation exclusively in the case where the given cubical diagram $\mathcal{X}$ is known to be strongly cocartesian. In this case, the cocartesian gap map of the cube $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ will be denoted

$$\gamma^{\mathcal{X}} : \Gamma^{\mathcal{X}} \to R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)}$$

where $\Gamma^{\mathcal{X}} := \operatorname{colim}_{U \neq \varnothing} R^{\mathcal{X}(U)}$. For $\hat{\mathcal{X}_\square}$, on the other hand, we will write

$$w^{\mathcal{X}} : W^{\mathcal{X}} \to (R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)})^{\times n}$$

with $W^{\mathcal{X}}$ defined by the analogous colimit for the cube $\mathcal{X}_{\square}$. Some justification for this special notation will be given in Remark 4.2.12 below. For now we observe

Lemma 4.2.9. *For any strongly cocartesian cube $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma^{\mathcal{X}} & \longrightarrow & W^{\mathcal{X}} \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma^{\mathcal{X}}}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w^{\mathcal{X}}} \\ R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)} & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & (R^{\mathcal{X}(\varnothing)})^{\times n} \end{array}$$

is a pullback in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$.

Proof. Immediate since colimits in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ are stable by base change. □

Combining Lemma 4.2.6 with the definition of the fiberwise join, we deduce immediately that

Lemma 4.2.10. *For any strongly cocartesian cubical diagram $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, the cocartesian gap map $\gamma^{\mathcal{X}}$ of the cube of representable functors $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ is given by the expression*

$$\gamma^{\mathcal{X}} = R^{k_1} \star_{R^K} \cdots \star_{R^K} R^{k_n}$$

where $k_i = \mathcal{X}(\varnothing \hookrightarrow \{i\}) : K \to K_i$.

The above discussion has an important special case, which we now describe. Note that a given strongly cocartesian diagram $\mathcal{X}$ is completely determined by the family of maps

$$\{f_i : \mathcal{X}(\varnothing) \to \mathcal{X}(\{i\})\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$$

Consequently, we may identify the category of strongly cocartesian n-cubes $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{X}(\varnothing) = K$ with the n-th cartesian power of the coslice category $(\mathcal{C}_{K/})^{\times n}$. As $\mathcal{C}$ has a terminal object, this category clearly has one as well, an n-cube which we will denote by $\mathcal{T}_n^K$ and which is determined by $\mathcal{T}_n^K(\varnothing) = K$ and $\mathcal{T}_n^K(\{i\}) = *$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. More generally, the reader can easily check that we have

$$\mathcal{T}_n^K(U) = K \star U$$

in the sense of Remark 4.1.2. Applying Yoneda as in the proof of 4.2.1 we find that

$$\left\langle \gamma^{\mathcal{T}_n^K}, F \right\rangle = (t_n F)(K) : F(K) \to \lim_U F(K \star U)$$

is Goodwillie's map $t_n F$ introduced in the previous section. As these distinguished strongly cocartesian cubes play a central role in the theory and are entirely determined by the given object K, it will be convenient to use the abbreviation

$$\gamma_n^K : \Gamma_n^K \to R^K$$

and

$$w_n^K : W_n^K \to (R^K)^{\times n}$$

for the maps $\gamma^{\mathcal{T}_n^K}$ and $w^{\mathcal{T}_n^K}$ constructed above. Note that by construction

$$w_n^K = (w_1^K)^{\square n}$$

where $w_1^K = R^{K \to *} : R^* \to R^K$. In this case, then the statement of Lemma 4.2.9 asserts that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_n^K & \longrightarrow & W_n^K \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma_n^K}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w_n^K} \\ R^K & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & (R^K)^{\times n} \end{array} \tag{4.2.11}$$

is a pullback for any $K \in \mathcal{C}$.

Remark 4.2.12. The pullback diagram (4.2.11) is analogous to a well-known construction in classical homotopy theory. For a pointed space (X, x), the n-fold *fat wedge* of X, denoted $W_n(X)$ may be defined as the iterated pushout product

$$\begin{array}{c} W_n(X) \\ {\scriptstyle w_n}\downarrow \\ X^{\times n} \end{array} \quad := \quad \begin{pmatrix} * \\ {\scriptstyle x}\downarrow \\ X \end{pmatrix}^{\square n} .$$

Note that it comes equipped with a canonical inclusion w_n into the n-fold product as shown. The pullback of this map along the diagonal $X \to X^{\times n}$ is known as the n-th *Ganea fibration*, and denoted $\Gamma_n(X)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_n(X) & \longrightarrow & W_n(X) \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma_n}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w_n} \\ X & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & X^{\times n} \end{array}$$

Recall from Section 2.3 that the pullback of an n-fold pushout product along the diagonal map is called the n-fold fiberwise join. Thus the map γ_n may alternatively be described as

$$\gamma_n = * \star_X \cdots \star_X *$$

From the discussion of the fiberwise join, then, it is immediately clear that the fiber of the map γ_n has the description

$$\mathrm{fib}_x \, \gamma_n \simeq (\Omega X)^{\star n}$$

as is well known.

In fact, this construction makes sense in any topos. Returning to the situation at hand, when the category $\mathcal{C}$ is pointed, we find that the representable functor R^* is in fact the terminal functor in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$. Hence for any object $K \in \mathcal{C}$, the terminal map $K \to *$ provides the representable functor R^K with a canonical base point

$$R^* \to R^K$$

Examining the pullback diagram (4.2.11) above, we find that it is exactly the n-th Ganea fibration of the representable R^K as calculated in the topos $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$, which is the justification for the notation introduced above. From this perspective, Theorem 4.3.1 (4) below may be read as saying that the Goodwillie localization of the functor category $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ is obtained by inverting the n-th Ganea fibration of the representable R^K for all $K \in \mathcal{C}$.

Let us also point out that diagram (4.2.11) is well-defined and still a pullback even if $\mathcal{C}$ is not pointed.

4.3 A Characterization of n-excisive maps

We now proceed to give a number of characterizations of the class of n-excisive maps as defined above. The reader will perhaps not be surprised to learn that they coincide with the P_n-local maps determined by the localization functor $P_n : [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}] \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$, though this is not a priori obvious. Furthermore, characterization (2) in the following theorem provides the main tool for establishing the compatibility of P_n-equivalences with the pushout product.

Theorem 4.3.1. *Let $f : F \to G$ be a map in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$. The following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *For every family of maps $\{h_i : K_i \to L_i\}_{i=0}^n$ in $\mathcal{C}$ we have*

$$R^{h_0} \square \cdots \square R^{h_n} \pitchfork f$$

(2) *For all $K \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $w_{n+1}^K \pitchfork f$.*

(3) *For every family of maps $\{h_i : K \to K_i\}_{i=0}^n$ in $\mathcal{C}$ we have*

$$R^{K_0} \star_{R^K} \cdots \star_{R^K} R^{K_n} \perp f$$

(4) *For all $K \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $\gamma_{n+1}^K \perp f$.*

(5) *The map f is P_n-local.*

(6) *The map f is n-excisive.*

Proof. We will begin with the equivalences (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5) $\Leftrightarrow$ (6).

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) This is the special case $K_i = *$ for all i

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (5) Examining the definition, we find that $\left\langle \gamma_{n+1}^K, F \right\rangle$ is the cartesian gap map of the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(K) & \longrightarrow & \lim\limits_{U \neq \emptyset} F(K * U) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G(K) & \longrightarrow & \lim\limits_{U \neq \emptyset} G(K * U), \end{array}$$

Hence if $\gamma^K_{n+1} \perp f$, this square is a pullback. Recognizing the right vertical map as $T_n(f)$, it follows that f is a pullback of $T_n(f)$. But then it is a pullback of all composites $T^k_n f$ because T_n preserves finite limits. Since finite limits commute with filtered colimits in $\mathcal{S}$, f is a pullback of $P_n f = \operatorname{colim}_k T^k_n f$, ie. f is P_n-local.

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (6) Now assume that f is P_n-local and let $\mathcal{X}$ be a strongly cocartesian $(n+1)$-cube. Write $K = \mathcal{X}(\varnothing)$. Consider the following commutative diagram:



We need to show that the front face is a pullback (see Definition 4.2.3) . The right and left faces are a pullbacks by assumption. The back square is trivially a pullback: both horizontal maps are isomorphisms because P_nF and P_nG are n-excisive functors by Proposition 4.1.3. Thus, the composite diagonal square is a pullback. Hence, the front is also a pullback.

(6) $\Rightarrow$ (3) According to Lemma 4.2.10, the cocartesian gap map of any strongly cocartesian diagram can be expressed in this form. Hence if f is n-excisive, it is orthogonal to such a map by definition.

We now treat statements (1) and (2)

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) This is the special case where $h_i = K \to *$ for all i.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) We have seen above that there is a pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma^K_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & W^K_{n+1} \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma^K_{n+1}}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w^K_{n+1}} \\ R^K & \xrightarrow[\Delta]{} & (R^K)^{\times n+1} \end{array}$$

for any $K \in \mathcal{C}$. But by Proposition 3.2.2 (7), f is orthogonal to any pullback of the map w^K_{n+1}, in particular γ^K_{n+1} as claimed.

(6) $\Rightarrow$ (1) Lemma 4.2.6 identifies the map

$$R^{h_0} \square \cdots \square R^{h_n}$$

as the cocartesian gap map of the strongly cocartesian cube determined by Construction 4.2.4. By Lemma 4.2.2, f is then orthogonal to this map. Since we have already seen that (5) $\Leftrightarrow$ (6), f is also P_n-local. But as the P_n-equivalences are closed under pullback, it follows that f is orthogonal to any pullback of the above map, which completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.3.2. It is not possible to replace the fiberwise orthogonality relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ it items (1) and (2) with the weaker external orthogonality relation $\perp$. Indeed, as pointed out in Example 4.2.7, the latter notion detects functors which are *of degree n*, a strictly weaker condition.

Remark 4.3.3. In [ABFJ17] we deduce the classical Blakers-Massey theorem from our generalized version by using the fact that the n-connected/n-truncated modalities are generated by pushout product powers of the map $S^0 \to *$. Theorem 4.3.1(2) states that in the same sense the Goodwillie tower, that is the n-excisive modalities, are generated by the pushout product powers of the maps $w_1^K : R^* \to R^K$ for all K in $\mathcal{C}$.

We can now prove the main result of this section. Recall the fiberwise diagonal $\{f, g\}$ of two maps f and g as defined in 3.3.1. By Proposition 3.2.2 it is an isomorphism if and only if the maps f and g are fiberwise orthogonal. A crucial role in the proof of the next theorem is played by the formula $\{f \square g, h\} = \{f, \{g, h\}\}$ demonstrated in Proposition 3.3.4. It allows us to use adjunction tricks for fiberwise orthogonality. The reader is invited to compare the next theorem with [ABFJ17, Cor. 3.15] where the n-connected/n-truncated modalities for $n \geq -2$ are treated.

Theorem 4.3.4. *Let f be a P_m-equivalence, g a P_n-equivalence and h a p-excisive map. Then:*

(1) *The map $\left\{w_n^K, h\right\}$ is $(p-n)$-excisive*

(2) *The map $f \square w_n^K$ is a P_{n+m}-equivalence*

(3) *The map $\{f, h\}$ is $(p-m-1)$-excisive*

(4) *The map $f \square g$ is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence*

Proof. (1). It is immediate from Lemma 4.2.6 that

$$w_{p+1}^K = w_{p-n+1}^K \square w_n^K$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.3.4 we have

$$\left\{w_{p+1}^K, h\right\} = \left\{w_{p-n+1}^K, \left\{w_n^K, h\right\}\right\}$$

for all $K \in \mathcal{C}$. The map on the left is an isomorphism by the assumption that h is p-excisive, and hence so is the one on the right. Theorem 4.3.1 (2) then gives the desired result.

(2). If k is any $(n+m)$-excisive map, we have

$$\left\{f \square w_n^K, k\right\} = \left\{f, \left\{w_n^K, k\right\}\right\}$$

But the map $\left\{w_n^K, k\right\}$ is m-excisive by (1).

(3). Again by Theorem 4.3.1 (2), it suffices to check that the map $\left\{w^K_{p-m}, \{f,h\}\right\}$ is an isomorphism for any $K \in \mathcal{C}$. But

$$\left\{w^K_{p-m}, \{f,h\}\right\} = \left\{w^K_{p-m} \square f, h\right\}$$

and since $w^K_{p-m} \square f$ is p-excisive by (2), the right map is an isomorphism.

(4). Let k be any $(m+n+1)$-excisive map. Then since

$$\{f \square g, k\} = \{f, \{g,k\}\}$$

and the map $\{g,k\}$ is $(m+n+1)-n-1 = m$ excisive, the result follows. □

The compatibility of the Goodwillie tower with the pushout product stated in Theorem 4.3.4(4) is what we are really after. It will allow us to prove the Blakers-Massey analogue for the Goodwillie tower. One direct application is

Example 4.3.5. Recall that a functor F is m-reduced if the map $F \to *$ is a P_{m-1}-equivalence. Let F be m-reduced and G be n-reduced. Then the map

$$(* \to F) \square (* \to G) = (F \vee G \to F \times G)$$

is a P_{m+n-1}-equivalence. Taking the cofiber it follows that $F \wedge G$ is $(m+n-1)$-reduced because, as a left class, P_n-equivalences are stable by cobase change. Similarly, the map

$$(F \to *) \square (G \to *) = (F \star G \to *)$$

is a P_{m+n-1}-equivalence.

4.4 The Blakers-Massey Theorem for the Goodwillie Tower

Theorem 4.4.1 (Blakers-Massey theorem for Goodwillie Calculus)**.** *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{g} & H \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ G & \longrightarrow & K \end{array}$$

be a pushout square of functors. If f is a P_m-equivalence and g is a P_n-equivalence, then the induced map

$$(f,g) : F \to G \times_K H$$

is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence.

Proof. If a map h is k-excisive then its diagonal Δh is also k-excisive because P_k is left exact. Theorem 4.3.4(4) then implies that $\Delta f \square \Delta g$ is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence: $\Delta f \square \Delta g$ is in the left class of the modality associated to P_{m+n+1}. Now we apply the Theorem 2.5.6 and learn that (f,g) is in the same left class. Hence, the gap map is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence. □

Theorem 4.4.2 ("Dual" Blakers-Massey theorem for Goodwillie Calculus)**.** *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & H \\ \downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow f \\ G & \xrightarrow{g} & K \end{array}$$

be a pullback square of functors. If f is a P_m-equivalence and g is a P_n-equivalence, then the cogap map

$$\lfloor f, g \rfloor : G \sqcup_F H \to K$$

is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3.4(4) the map $f \,\square\, g$ is a P_{m+n+1}-equivalence. By Theorem 2.5.7 the same holds for the cogap $\lfloor f, g \rfloor$. □

4.5 Delooping theorems

Consider a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{S}$. There is a canonical map $q_n F : P_n F \to P_{n-1} F$ explicitly described in [Goo03, p. 664]. Let us denote by C the pushout of the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_n F & \longrightarrow & P_0 F \\ {\scriptstyle q_n F}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c} \\ P_{n-1} F & \longrightarrow & C. \end{array}$$

in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$. Applying P_n one obtains the induced square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_n F & \longrightarrow & P_0 F \\ {\scriptstyle q_n F}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_n c} \\ P_{n-1} F & \longrightarrow & P_n C. \end{array}$$

Theorem 4.5.1. *The latter square becomes a pullback in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$, and in turn in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$. The left vertical map becomes an effective epimorphism in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$.*

Proof. The top horizontal map is a P_0-equivalence and the left vertical map is a P_{n-1}-equivalence. By Theorem 4.4.1 the gap map is a P_n-equivalence. This says that the square is a pullback after applying P_n as claimed. The inclusion of $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ to $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ preserves pullbacks.

Using Theorem A.0.12 one observes that the map $q_n F$ is a effective epimorphism in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$, and consequently, so is the right vertical map c. So their composite $P_n c$ is a effective epimorphism. □

Theorem 4.5.2. (Arone-Dwyer-Lesh [ADL08, Thm. 4.2]) *For every n-reduced functor F the canonical map*

$$P_{2n-1} F \to \Omega P_{2n-1} \Sigma F$$

is an isomorphism. If F is also $(2n-1)$-excisive it is infinitely deloopable.

Proof. The isomorphism follows by applying Theorem 4.4.1 to the pushout square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & * \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ * & \longrightarrow & \Sigma F. \end{array}$$

The second statement is now obvious. □

A special case of the previous fact is

Corollary 4.5.3. (Goodwillie [Goo03, Section 2]) *If F is n-homogeneous then*

$$F \cong \Omega P_n \Sigma F.$$

Hence, it is infinitely deloopable.

This corollary yields an independent proof of Goodwillie's delooping result.

Theorem 4.5.4. *The category of n-homogeneous functors over a fixed base is stable for $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. One needs to prove that a commutative square is a pushout if and only if it is a pullback. This follows directly from Theorems 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. □

A Effective Epimorphisms and Monomorphisms of n-excisive Functors

We will write $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ for the full subcategory of n-excisive functors. As stated in Proposition 4.1.3, the Goodwillie localization functor P_n is left exact and admits a fully-faithful right adjoint $\iota_n : [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)} \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$. In particular, the category $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ is a topos. Recall that every topos admits a factorization system consisting of the monomorphisms and effective epimorphisms. Our goal in this appendix is to describe this factorization system in the topos $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$. We being by recalling the definition of these two classes of maps.

Definition A.0.1. A map $f : X \to Y$ in a topos $\mathcal{E}$ a *monomorphism* if its diagonal map

$$\Delta f : X \to X \times_Y X$$

is an isomorphism. An *effective epimorphism* is a map that is (externally) left orthogonal to any monomorphism.

Example A.0.2. In $\mathcal{S}$, a map is a monomorphisms if and only if it is the inclusion of a union of path components. The effective epimorphisms in spaces are exactly the maps that induce a surjection on the set of components.

Before stating the next theorem, recall that an object $X \in \mathcal{E}$ is called *discrete* if for all objects Y, the space $\mathcal{C}(Y, X)$ is discrete. Moreover, [Lur09, Proposition 5.5.6.18] shows that if $\mathcal{E}$ is presentable (for example, if $\mathcal{E}$ is a topos) then the inclusion of the full subcategory $\pi_0\mathcal{E} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ of discrete objects admits a left adjoint $\pi_0 : \mathcal{E} \to \pi_0\mathcal{E}$ which we will refer to as 0-*truncation*. A posteriori, we may characterize the discrete objects $X \in \mathcal{E}$ as those for which the canonical map $X \to \pi_0 X$ is an isomorphism.

Example A.0.3. If $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{S}$, then the functor π_0 is the usual one, sending a space to its set of path components regarded as a discrete space.

Example A.0.4. If $\mathcal{E} = [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$, it is not hard to see that

$$(\pi_0 F)(K) = \pi_0(F(K))$$

so that a functor F is discrete if and only if it takes values in discrete spaces.

The following proposition asserts that the situation of Example A.0.2 is in fact generic in the sense that monomorphisms and effective epimorphisms in a topos $\mathcal{E}$ are essentially determined by their restriction to discrete objects.

Proposition A.0.5. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphism in a topos.*

(1) *The map f is a monomorphism if and only if $\pi_0 f$ is a monomorphism and the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & \pi_0 X \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_0 f} \\ Y & \longrightarrow & \pi_0 Y \end{array}$$

is a pullback.

(2) *The map f is an effective epimorphism if and only if $\pi_0 f$ is an effective epimorphism.*

While the previous proposition is useful, and in some sense consistent with the idea that a topos $\mathcal{E}$ should behave similarly to the category $\mathcal{S}$ of spaces, it does not provide us with any information about what the functor π_0 actually *does* to an object X in a general topos $\mathcal{E}$. And indeed, the calculation of $\pi_0 X$ depends heavily on $\mathcal{E}$, as we shall see. In the case at hand, therefore, where we wish to compare discrete objects in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ and $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$, we will need to distinguish between the associated π_0 functors.

Definition A.0.6. In what follows, we write π_0 for 0-truncation in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ and $\pi_0^{(n)}$ for the 0-truncation functor in the n-excisive localization $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$.

Remark A.0.7. It is important to note that the inclusion $\iota_n : [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)} \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$ *does not* commute with π_0, except in the case $n = 0$. Indeed, the formula of Example A.0.4 is false in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$. A correct formula is given in Remark A.0.11 below. On the other hand, as ι_n is a right adjoint, it preserves limits and therefore reflects discrete objects. In other words, if a functor F is n-excisive, it is discrete in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$ if and only if it is discrete in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]$.

In fact, for $n = 1$, we already have the following:

Lemma A.0.8. *Let F be a 1-excisive functor which is discrete. Then F is in fact constant. More specifically, the canonical map $F(K) \to F(*)$ is an equivalence for all objects $K \in \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Note that for any $K \in \mathcal{C}$, ΣK is a pointed object. Consequently, we have a factorization of the identity map on $F(*)$.

$$F(*) \longrightarrow F(\Sigma K) \longrightarrow F(*)$$

Since each of these objects is a discrete space (i.e., a set) by the remarks above, we conclude that the map $F(*) \to F(\Sigma K)$ is an injective, and hence a monomorphism in $\mathcal{S}$. By the definition of monomorphism, then, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(*) & = & F(*) \\ \| & \ulcorner & \downarrow \\ F(*) & \rightarrowtail & F(\Sigma K) \end{array}$$

is a pullback. On the other hand, since F is 1-excisive, for any object K we have a pullback square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(K) & \longrightarrow & F(*) \\ \downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow \\ F(*) & \rightarrowtail & F(\Sigma K) \end{array}$$

hence the canonical map $F(K) \to F(*)$ must be an equivalence by the uniqueness of pullbacks. □

Lemma A.0.9. *For $F \in [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(1)}$, we have*

$$\pi_0^{(1)} F \simeq \pi_0 P_0 F$$

Proof. Note that as the functor P_0 commutes with all colimits, it *does* commute with π_0. Hence

$$\pi_0^{(1)} F(*) \simeq P_0 \pi_0^{(1)} F(*) \simeq \pi_0 P_0 F(*)$$

One the other hand, $\pi_0^{(1)} F$ is discrete by definition, and so the previous lemma then asserts that $\pi_0^{(1)} F$ is in fact constant. The fact that the functors agree at the terminal object $*$ then implies that they agree for all $K \in \mathcal{C}$. □

Proposition A.0.10. *Let $f : F \to G$ be an n-excisive monomorphism. Then f is 0-excisive.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $n \geq 1$. For $n = 1$, we are to show that every 1-excisive monomorphism is in fact 0-excisive. So let $f : F \to G$ be a 1-excisive monomorphism. We claim first that, without loss of generality, we may assume that F and G are in fact 1-excisive functors. This is because every 1-excisive map sits in a pullback square of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & P_1 F \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_1 f} \\ G & \longrightarrow & P_1 G \end{array}$$

But since P_1 preserves monomorphisms and 0-excisive maps are closed under pullback, then if we can show $P_1 f$ is 0-excisive, it follows that f is as well. But of course, $P_1 f$ has the desired form: it is a monomorphism between 1-excisive functors.

Now let $f : F \to G$ be a monomorphism and 1-excisive map between 1-excisive functors. Consider the cube:



All of the vertical maps are monomorphisms since P_0, π_0 and $\pi_0^{(1)}$ preserve them. Both the left and the right face are pullbacks by Proposition A.0.5. By Lemma A.0.9, the front two horizontal maps are in fact isomorphisms. Consequently, the back face is a pullback, which says that f is 0-excisive.

For the inductive step, let $f : F \to G$ be $(n+1)$-excisive and a monomophism. Note that the functor $\{w_K, -\}$ preserves monomorphisms. So, for all K, $\{w_K, f\}$ is a monomorphism. But it is also n-excisive by Theorem 4.3.4(1). By the induction hypothesis, it is then 0-excisive. This, in turn, shows that f is 1-excisive. Then the case $n = 1$ implies that f is also 0-excisive.

□

Remark A.0.11. A consequence of the previous proposition is that the result of Lemma A.0.9 is in fact true for all n. That is, for $F \in [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$, we have

$$\pi_0^{(n)} F \simeq \pi_0 P_0 F$$

Theorem A.0.12. *Let $f : F \to G$ be a morphism of $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$. Then:*

(1) *The map f is monomorphism if and only if $P_0 f$ is a monomorphism and the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & P_0 F \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_0 f} \\ G & \longrightarrow & P_0 G \end{array}$$

is a pullback.

(2) *The map f is effective epimorphism if and only if $P_0 f$ is effective epimorphism.*

Remark A.0.13. We invite the reader to admire the symmetry between the statements of Proposition A.0.5 and Theorem A.0.12.

Proof. ($1 \Rightarrow$). This is immediate since P_0 preserves monomorphisms and the pullback expresses just the statement that f is 0-excisive.

($1 \Leftarrow$). Monomorphisms are always stable by pullback.

($2 \Rightarrow$). The functor P_0 preserves effective epimorphisms because it is cocontinuous.

($2 \Leftarrow$). Note that f is an effective epimorphism if and only if it is orthogonal to every monomorphism in $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}]^{(n)}$. So let $g : H \to K$ be such a monomorphism and consider a lifting problem as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \longrightarrow & H \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ G & \longrightarrow & K \end{array}$$

Note that since g is a monomorphism, it is enough to show that a lift exists, as its uniqueness is automatic. Now apply the functor P_0 to obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_0 F & \longrightarrow & P_0 H \\ {\scriptstyle P_0 f}\downarrow & \overset{\exists!}{\nearrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_0 g} \\ P_0 G & \longrightarrow & P_0 K \end{array}$$

Observe that the left map is an effective epimorphism by assumption. Since P_0 preserves monomorphisms, this square has a unique lift. But now composition of our lift with the map $p_0 G : G \to P_0 G$ yields the lift shown in the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F & \longrightarrow & H & \longrightarrow & P_0 H \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & \overset{\exists!}{\nearrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} & \ulcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_0 g} \\ G & \longrightarrow & K & \longrightarrow & P_0 K \end{array}$$

On the other hand, Proposition A.0.10 asserts that the right hand square is a pullback. Hence we have an induced unique lift to the original problem. This shows that f is an effective epimorphism. □

References

[ABFJ17] Mathieu Anel, Georg Biedermann, Eric Finster, and André Joyal. A generalized Blakers-Massey theorem. preprint `arXiv:1703.09050`, 2017.

[ADL08] Gregory Z. Arone, William G. Dwyer, and Kathryn Lesh. Loop structures in Taylor towers. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 8(1):173–210, 2008.

[BJM15] Kristine Bauer, Brenda Johnson, and Randy McCarthy. Cross effects and calculus in an unbased setting. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 367(9):6671–6718, 2015.

[BR14] Georg Biedermann and Oliver Röndigs. Calculus of functors and model categories, II. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 14(5):2853–2913, 2014.

[Goo90] Thomas G. Goodwillie. Calculus I: The First Derivative of Pseudoisotropy Theory. *K-Theory*, 4, 1990.

[Goo92] Thomas G. Goodwillie. Calculus II: Analytic Functors. *K-Theory*, 5, 1992.

[Goo03] Thomas G. Goodwillie. Calculus III: Taylor Series. *Geometry and Topology*, 7, October 2003.

[Heu15] Gijs Heuts. Goodwillie approximations to higher categories. `arXiv:1510.03304`, October 2015.

[Joy08] André Joyal. Notes on quasicategories. `http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~may/IMA/Joyal.pdf`, 2008.

[Lur09] Jacob Lurie. *Higher topos theory*, volume 170 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.

[Rez05] Charles Rezk. Toposes and homotopy toposes. unpublished, `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/~rezk`, 2005.

[Rez13] Charles Rezk. A streamlined proof of Goodwillie's n-excisive approximation. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 13(2):1049–1051, 2013.